

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

DIAMANTINA P. MARQUEZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

WILSHIRE CREDIT CORP., et al,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

C.A. C-07-245

ORDER STRIKING PLEADING (S)

The clerk has filed Defendant Wilshire Credit Corporation's Motion for Leave to File It's (sic) Second Amended Answer (D.E. 33), however, it is deficient in the area(s) checked below:

1. ___ Pleading is not signed by, or by permission of, attorney-in-charge.(LR5.2)
2. ___ Pleading is not in compliance with LR11.3.A(1) through (6)
3. ___ Caption of the pleading is incomplete (LR10.1)
4. ___ No certificate of service, or explanation why service is not required (LR5.4)
5. X No statement re: conference w/opposing counsel/party (LR7.1D)
6. ___ Separate proposed order not attached (LR7.1C)
7. ___ Motion to consolidate is not in compliance with LR7.6
8. ___ Other:

The Court hereby VACATES its previous strike order, Docket Entry No. 34, because that strike order inadvertently identified the problem with Docket Entry No. 33 as "No certificate of service, or explanation why service is not required (LR5.4)." As noted above, the correct reason that Docket Entry No. 33 must be struck is because it does not contain a statement re: conference with opposing counsel/party (LR7.1D).

The clerk is hereby ORDERED to strike the above instrument (s) from the record and notify counsel of such action.

Dated: July 27, 2007


JUDGE PRESIDING